

Appl. No. : **10/724,470**
Filed : **November 26, 2003**

REMARKS

The December 5, 2005 Office Action was based on pending Claims 1–49. By this Response, Applicant is amending Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 10, 21, 30, 31 and 39 and is cancelling Claims 2–4, 11–15, 22, 23, 33 and 46 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 7, 9, 16–20, 24–29, 32, 34–38, 40–45, and 47–49 remain as originally filed.

Thus, after entry of the foregoing amendments, Claims 1, 5–10, 16–21, 24–32, 34–45 and 47–49 are pending and presented for further consideration. In view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks set forth below, Applicant submits that Claims 1, 5–10, 16–21, 24–32, 34–45 and 47–49 are in condition for allowance.

SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS AND REJECTIONS

The December 5, 2005 Office Action objected to Claims 4, 6, 15, 16, 23, 26, 30, 33, 37, 41 and 47 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

The Office Action objected to Claim 30 because of claim informalities.

The Office Action rejected Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Office Action also rejected Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 21 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10–14, 17–19, 21, 24, 25, 27–29, 31, 32, 34–36, 38–40, 42–45 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over 5,060,143 to Lee (“Lee”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,222,225 to Groves (“Groves”).

Claims 9, 20 and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Groves, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,404,473 to Papworth et al. (“Papworth”).

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Submitted concurrently herewith is a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement citing eleven (11) references, which were cited during the prosecution of co-pending related U.S. patent applications. While Applicant does not believe that these references will affect the patentability of the pending claims, Applicant respectfully

Appl. No. : 10/724,470
Filed : November 26, 2003

requests the Examiner to consider the pending claims in connection with these references in order to make them of record.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in several of the pending claims. In particular, the Office Action objected to Claims 4, 15, 16, 23, 26, 30, 33, 37, 41 and 47 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but indicated that such claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Office Action also indicated that Claim 6 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection and to include all the limitation of the corresponding base claims and intervening claims.

As discussed in more detail below, the limitations of several of the above-identified dependent claims (i.e., Claims 4, 15, 23 and 33) have been incorporated into the corresponding base (independent) claims. Dependent Claims 16, 26, 37, 41 and 47 remain as originally filed. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that the amended independent claims and their related dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

OBJECTION TO CLAIM 30 FOR CLAIM INFORMALITIES

The Office Action objected to Claim 30 for claim informalities, stating that the third line of the claim should read "to" instead of "in." Applicant has amended Claim 30 and respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH

The Office Action rejected Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Although Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's rejection, Applicant has cancelled Claim 22 to expedite allowance of the present application.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 11, 21 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Appl. No. : 10/724,470
Filed : November 26, 2003

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 8

Claims 1, 5, 6, and 8 were rejected as being unclear for reciting the phrase "data received from the second data source." By the foregoing amendments, Applicant has revised the "data" received from the second data source to recite "test data string." Applicant has also revised Claim 1 to clarify that the matches from two comparators are with reference to one comparison operation. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1, 5, 6, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Claim 11

Claim 11 was rejected as being unclear for containing the phrase "an external string execution unit." Although Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's rejection, Applicant has cancelled Claim 11 to expedite allowance of the present application.

Claims 21 and 31

Claims 21 and 31 were rejected as being unclear for containing the phrase "starting address . . . for said compare operation." In particular, the Office Action indicated that it was unclear whether the recited "starting address" is the address where the operation is stored in memory or is an address used by the search operation. Applicant has amended Claims 21 and 31 to clarify that the "starting address" is "used in the compare operation." Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 21 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

Claim 21

Claim 21 was rejected as being unclear for containing the phrase "cached data." Applicant has amended Claim 21 to clarify that the "cached data" in the last paragraph of the claim is referring to the "cached data stored in the cache line of the cache memory." Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 10–14, 17–19, 21, 24, 25, 27–29, 31, 32, 34–36, 38–40, 42–46 and 48 as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Groves.

Appl. No. : 10/724,470
Filed : November 26, 2003

Claims 9, 20 and 49 were also rejected as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Groves and in further view of Papworth.

Independent Claim 1

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of cancelled dependent Claim 4, which included the limitations of cancelled dependent Claim 3 and was found by the Examiner to contain allowable subject matter. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that neither Lee nor Groves, nor a combination thereof, teaches or suggests the cache memory recited in amended Claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of Claim 1 to be withdrawn and submits that amended Claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 10

Independent Claim 10 has been amended to include the subject matter of cancelled dependent Claim 15, which the Examiner found to contain allowable subject matter. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that neither Lee nor Groves, nor a combination thereof, teaches or suggests the cache memory recited in amended Claim 10. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of Claim 10 to be withdrawn and submits that amended Claim 10 is in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 21

Independent Claim 21 has been amended to include the subject matter of cancelled dependent Claim 23, which the Examiner found to contain allowable subject matter. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that neither Lee nor Groves, nor a combination thereof, teaches or suggests the method recited in amended Claim 21. Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of Claim 21 to be withdrawn and submits that amended Claim 21 is in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 31

Independent Claim 31 has been amended to include the subject matter of cancelled dependent Claim 33, which the Examiner found to contain allowable subject matter. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that neither Lee nor Groves, nor a combination thereof, teaches or suggests the method recited in amended Claim 31.

Appl. No. : 10/724,470
Filed : November 26, 2003

Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of Claim 31 to be withdrawn and submits that amended Claim 31 is in condition for allowance.

Independent Claim 39

Independent Claim 39 is believed to be patentably distinguished over Lee and Groves for reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to amended independent Claim 1 and for the different aspects recited therein.

Dependent Claims

Claims 5 and 7–9 depend from independent Claim 1 and are believed to be patentably distinguished over the cited references for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1 and for the additional features recited therein.

Claims 17–20 depend from independent Claim 10 and are believed to be patentably distinguished over the cited references for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 10 and for the additional features recited therein.

Claims 24, 25 and 27–29 depend from independent Claim 21 and are believed to be patentably distinguished over the cited references for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 21 and for the additional features recited therein.

Claims 32, 34–36 and 38 depend from independent Claim 31 and are believed to be patentably distinguished over the cited references for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 31 and for the additional features recited therein.

Claims 40, 42–45, 48 and 49 depend from independent Claim 39 and are believed to be patentably distinguished over the cited references for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 39 and for the additional features recited therein.

REQUEST FOR TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

Pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 713.01, in order to expedite prosecution of this application, Applicant's undersigned attorney of record hereby formally requests a telephone interview with the Examiner as soon as the Examiner has considered the effect of the arguments presented above. Applicant's attorney can be reached at the general office number listed below.

Appl. No. : 10/724,470
Filed : November 26, 2003

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested. If further issues remain to be resolved, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned such that any remaining issues may be promptly resolved.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 2-24-06

By: John R. King
John R. King
Registration No. 34,362
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(949) 760-0404

2356208_1
021606